

AORN PROVERB No. 3.

How to make money.
We are all actuated by the same desire, namely, to accumulate the great amount of money here in the shortest possible period of time. One individual thinks of it in one way, another in a different way, but all of these theories are likely to land the speculator in the ditch.

Do you want to know a "dead end and shut" way to make money? Listen: Suppose that by going to the

RIGHT PLACE

"A Man may Buy Gold too Dear."
But he never pays too much for an AORN Store. Fortunately they are made in such a variety of styles, that one can get them at almost any price.

persistently keep up this practice. It may sound to "get there, all the same." You must out this project? We will tell you.

SAY \$25.00
in the purchase of a vehicle; \$5 in the price of a cooking or heating stove; you secure a steel post hole digger for \$10, instead of the regular price of \$11, and you buy a wheelbarrow for \$10, instead of the regular price of \$11; the amount does not figure, so long as you take a little while longer, but you are mentally, who assists me in carrying out this project? We will tell you.

Furs Stored During the Summer
Skins Tanned and Mounted.

E. PINKERT
PRACTICAL FURRIER
1007 MAIN STREET.
KANSAS CITY, MO.

MANUFACTURER OF
FINE FURS,
Sealskin Sacques, Caps, Muffs,
BOAS, ROBES AND MATTS.

Sea Skin Garments
A SPECIALTY.

We have an excellent stock of Ladies' and Gents' Imported and Domestic Fur Goods suitable for

CHRISTMAS PRESENTS.
Seal Skin Sacques, Caps, Muffs, and Collars, Gents' Seal Skin Gloves, Collars and Cuffs, Mats, Rugs and Baggy Robes.

We have the finest assortment in the city and at the lowest prices. All our work is warranted. We kindly invite you to call and see us.

SEE OUR EXHIBIT AT THE FAIR.
E. PINKERT, 1007 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

A CHANGE
IN MY BUSINESS WILL TAKE EFFECT
JANUARY 1st, 1892.

St. Vitus Dance Cured!
My boy, 13 years old, was afflicted by St. Vitus Dance. He could not go to school for years. Two bottles of Pastor Koehn's Nerve Tonic restored his health, and he is now attending school.

RECOMMENDS IT TO MANY.
My daughter became epileptic about five years ago through a fright. All physicians failed to do anything, until I used Pastor Koehn's Nerve Tonic, which at once dispelled the attack. It is the best remedy I ever used, and I have recommended it to many of our acquaintances in a great degree of confidence.

JOHN GOEHNER.
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE
By virtue of an order of the probate court of Lafayette county, Mo., made on the 28th day of November, 1891, the undersigned public administrator for said county, do hereby give notice that all persons having claims against the estate of the late Thomas C. Goehner, deceased, are required to exhibit them for allowance to the administrator within one year after the date of said order or they may be precluded from any benefit by such estate. If such claims are not exhibited within two years from the date of said order they will be forever barred.

W. H. BRUNS
PROPRIETOR OF
Freedom Herd of Poland China Hogs

I have about 50 head of pure bred Poland China hogs, of the best quality, and I am now receiving orders for them. They are now ready for service, and are offered at a bargain.

AND SO DO
To eak Men
More than Half a Million
OTHER PEOPLE,
BECAUSE
IS THE BEST.
uy No Other.

G. F. King, Lexington
COMMERCIAL BANK.
LEXINGTON, MO.

PAID UP CAPITAL, \$75,000.
BUSINESS ON A LIBERAL AND POPULAR BASIS.

WANTED.
All persons who Cook and Bake to send in the best of service to the public. I am now seeking for a few more. If you are interested, please call on me at my office, 1007 Main Street, Lexington, Mo.

FOR SALE.
A splendid work horse, double or single, and a pair of mules, all of the best quality, and at a bargain. Inquire at Green & Dyer's, Lexington, Mo.

PILES.
A splendid work horse, double or single, and a pair of mules, all of the best quality, and at a bargain. Inquire at Green & Dyer's, Lexington, Mo.

Weekly Intelligencer.

CONDITION OF FINANCES.
FACTS GLEANED FROM SECRETARY FOSTER'S REPORT.

Points in regard to the Transactions of the Year—The Gold and Silver of the Country—National Bank—Effects of the New Tariff.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—The annual report of Secretary of the Treasury, Foster was submitted to congress yesterday.

The secretary reports that the revenues of the government from all sources for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1891, were \$428,344,818. The expenditures for the same period were \$451,344,470, leaving a surplus of \$27,397,757.57. As compared with the fiscal year 1890 the receipts fell off \$5,418,847.25, and there was an increase of \$27,397,757.57 in the ordinary expenditures. It is estimated that the revenues for the fiscal year 1892 will amount to \$431,000,000 and the expenditures to \$450,000,000.

With reference to the circulation of the report says: "The stringency in the money market during the year 1891 was not relieved by the prompt and effective measures of my predecessors, and happily disappeared without producing the grave consequences which were feared by the public; but its existence, and the widespread apprehension which it created, induced a revival of the erroneous idea that the volume of money in circulation was not only inadequate to the needs of the country, but was very much less per capita than during the so-called flush times which followed the civil war."

The amount of money in circulation has been very largely increased since the close of the fiscal year. The amount July 1, 1891 was \$1,407,400,707 and the amount per capita was \$23.41. The return of gold to the United States, the purchase of silver at a price of 75 cents, and the distribution of the treasury note, and the large volume of \$1,377,292,000 and the per capita amount to \$23.84.

The volume of money in circulation was the largest in the history of the mint in this country, aggregating 119,547,577 pieces, valued as follows:

Gold, \$24,173,292.50; silver dollars, \$36,332,802; subsidiary silver, \$2,929,318.35; minor coins, \$1,166,936.50. Total, \$64,542,350.

In referring to national banks the report says: "The last report of condition of the national banks, as required by law, was made on September 30, 1891. At that date 3,077 associations reported an aggregate capital of \$67,439,871; surplus, \$10,576,498; undivided profits, \$10,324,474. The gross deposits, including amounts due to banks, was \$1,890,344,239, and loans and discounts at \$1,890,344,239, and increase in both items over any previous date, being \$174,000,000.

United States bonds, of which \$700,000,000 were to secure circulating notes; also \$25,000,000 of United States bonds, legal tender notes, and \$15,720,000 in United States certificates of deposits.

The last report received attention. The existing tariff went into effect as to most of its provisions on October 1, 1890. Under its operation during the twelve months ending September 30, 1891, the first five days of October being under the old tariff, the value of imports of merchandise was \$234,716,007, an increase of \$1,347,110 over the value of the corresponding months of the preceding year.

Of this total the value of free goods was \$197,252,007, an increase of \$1,347,110 over the value of free goods during the corresponding months of the previous year. The proportion of merchandise admitted free was 48.18 per cent of the total importation, as against 38.18 per cent for the corresponding months of the preceding year.

The tariff on imports of goods from the United States, which is the most important of the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE TRADE SKY CLEAR.

THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE ALIKE BRIGHT.

The Low Price of Cotton in the South The Only Disturbing Feature—Active in Merchandise in All Parts of the Country.

New York, Dec. 18.—R. G. Dun & Co. in a recent issue of Trade Notes, says: "As the holidays draw near all signs indicate a large volume of business at the present time. The general feeling is one of improvement in the future, except in parts of the South, where the unusual accumulation of cotton, and its low prices, have a depressing influence. There is no lack of money in any part of the country, except at southern points, and the mere fact that cotton now accumulated at a few ports and interior towns represents fully \$200,000,000 in value and suggests that it is not permanent. It is a good sign, also, that collections on the whole are improving, though slow at New Orleans and some southern ports, and only fair in some times at eastern cities."

RUSSIA'S PLIGHT VERY BAD. The Situation Growing Constantly Worse—Famine Feared—The Chronicle's St. Petersburg Correspondent writes: "Matters here are arising from bad to worse. The whole energy of the department of finance seems centered in manipulating funds on the Berlin and Paris exchanges. Despite reports of gold imports, the imperial treasury does not show an increase. There is nothing to show whether the gold is locked in the war chest or what becomes of it."

All classes are discouraged because of the half heartedness of the measures taken by the government. The consequences of the famine are only beginning to be realized. Merchants claim that the probability of grain exports has been locked up capital and that there is no circulation of money. They are unable to collect their debts and therefore decline to pay what they owe shopkeepers. The cessation of most festivities causes dire distress to small traders.

The famine funds have been frittered away by local authorities. The general medical measures exist only on paper. Cases of enormous expenditures on the part of the government have been advanced by those unfriendly to the government. The whole episode appears to be a setting of the clock back.

THE GREAT SUCCESS OF A PRACTICAL JOKER. Boston, Dec. 18.—The Boston Herald writes: "An Italian employed by the Metropolitan sewer company, had just lighted his pipe when he discovered that the gas was not working. He was taking off of his hand. It is supposed that dynamite was placed in the pipe by a practical joker."

REMARKS MADE PUBLIC. The Hon. Mr. Francis, the pastor of the British and American church, in an interesting sermon, said that the fall of the tower of Babel was the result of the pride of man.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.

THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON SUGAR. The removal of the duty on sugar has reduced its price to the consumer, and this result is not in contrast with the doctrine of protection to home industries, because the limited production of sugar, under the tariff, has been reduced in many instances, and the result has been a large increase in the value of imports.